

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                           | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/877,378                                | 06/08/2001  | Michael Nelson       | Vmware 10               | 2444             |
| 7590 02/16/2005                           |             | EXAMINER             |                         |                  |
| VMWARE, INC                               |             |                      | TRUONG, LECHI           |                  |
| ATTN: JEFFREY PEARCE<br>3145 PORTER DRIVE |             |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |
| PALO ALTO, CA 94304                       |             |                      | 2126                    | 4                |
|   |             |                      | DATE MAILED: 02/16/2005 |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | Application No.  | Applicant(s)   |
|---|--|--|
| Advisory Action   | 09/877,378   | MICHEAL NELSON   |
| ,, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,  | Examiner   | Art Unit   |
|   | LeChi Truong   | 2126   |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ars on the cover sheet with the c  | orrespondence address  |
| THE REPLY FILED 19 January 2005 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.   | roid abandonment of this applica<br>) a timely filed amendment which<br>I (with appeal fee); or (3) a timel  | ation. A proper reply to a n places the application in   |
| PERIOD FOR RE   | EPLY [check either a) or b)]   |  |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The   | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF | g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension |
| fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of<br>fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the control of the contro | the shortened statutory period for reply control to the mail   | originally set in the final Office action; or  |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF  |  |  |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be   | ecause:  |  |
| (a)   they raise new issues that would require further  | er consideration and/or search (s  | see NOTE below);   |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b  | elow);   | •  |
| (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in<br>issues for appeal; and/or   | n better form for appeal by mate   | rially reducing or simplifying the   |
| (d)  they present additional claims without cancell   | ng a corresponding number of fi  | nally rejected claims.   |
| NOTE:   |  |  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject  | ion(s):  |  |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).   | be allowable if submitted in a se  | eparate, timely filed amendment  |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See  |  | dered but does NOT place the   |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.   | ause it is not directed SOLELY t   | o issues which were newly  |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we   |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed: 4-11,13-20,25-27,30-32,34-40,44 a   | <u>nd 45</u> .   |  |
| Claim(s) objected to: NONE.   |  | •  |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1-3,12,21-24,28,29,33 and 41-43.   |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: NONE.  |  |  |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr   | oved or b) disapproved by t  | he Examiner.   |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer  | nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).  |  |
| 10. Other:  | ME   | NG-ALT. AN<br>Y PATENT EXAMINER  |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

- 1.Applicant amendment filed on 02/03/2005 has been considered but they are not persuasive.
- 2.In the remarks, applicant argued in substance:
- (1) "Sato, no software module that initializes the computer (presumably, the control program PC)".
- (2) "Sato that there would ever be a complete context switch away from the control program".
- (3) "Sato does not teach any form of kernel" substantially displacing COS from the system level and itself running at the system level... including scheduling execution of the COS on the hardware processors".
- (4) " having a separate kernel running on a dedicated processor".
- 2. Examiner respectfully traversed Applicant's remarks:

As to the point (1), Bonola teaches the host operating system 26 is loaded from the storage device 22 into the system memory 26 at boot time (col 5, ln 1-7).

As to the point (2), "a complete context switch away from the control program" was not in the claim.

As to the point (3), Sato teaches itself running at the system level (an extended control register of the hardware 22 is controlled by the supervisor operating system, col 2, In 31-35/ fig. 1), substantially displacing COS from the system level ... including scheduling execution of the COS on the hardware processors (the first operating system being provided with access to said first control registers by the supervisory operating system; the supervisory operating system writing a first value in the register indication bit of said extended control register when the first operating system run, col 3, In 57-61 / In 65-67 to col 4, In 1-2/ col 2, In 34-40/ In 49-In 50-51 / In 55-58 and abstrac In 8-13). Since the supervisor operating system schedules and controls the first and second operating system to access to the register of the hardware 22, the supervisor operating system displace the operating system from the system level and schedule execution of the operating system on the hardware processor (Fig. 1). Bonola also teaches itself running at the system level (loaded the real-time operating system may be excuted on the I/O processor prior to the host operating system, col 9, In 40-43).

As to the point 4, having or not having a separate kernel running on a dedicated processor was not in the claim.